

amended to correct typographical errors and informalities. In the Final Office action, claims 1-4, 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis (U.S. 5,610,653); and claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis in view of Casement et al. (U.S. 5,969,748). Applicants submit that all of the pending claims in the application are patentable over the cited references, and reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Independent claims 1 and 11 include, among other limitations "a two dimensional matrix composed of rows and columns of tiles, wherein either the rows of tiles or the columns of tiles correspond to **overall program ratings** and ~~either~~ either the rows of tiles or the columns of tiles correspond to **specific program content** indications and depicts highlighting of individual tiles or groups of tiles based on the cursor movement commands," and "blocking or allowing viewing of television programs based on the overall program ratings and specific content ratings."

However, FIGs. 1A and 4A of Abecassis show a segment descriptive structure that includes a number of content categories 111 and coding scale 112. Col. 7, line 61 to col. 7, line 1. The coding scale 112 consists of four different categories, i.e., "None," "Implied," "Explicit," and "Graphic." Abecassis is very clear that the coding scale 112 is not the same as overall programming rating by emphasizing that "twenty different content categories (e.g. bloodshed, violence, nudity, etc.)" "can be edited at four levels of explicitness (e.g. none,

implied, explicit, and graphic)." Col. 3, lines 45-48.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertion in the Office action that the coding scale 112 mirrors the rating system of MPAA, "which is illustrated in Figure 1D." FIG. 1D of Abecassis describes a video segment descriptive structure that is **"not category specific."** Col. 8, lines 35-36. Applicants are unable to find any teaching or suggestion in Abecassis for "a two dimensional matrix composed of . . . **overall program ratings** and . . . **specific program content**," as required by the independent claims 1 and 11.

For example, as shown in the original FIG. 23A (currently FIG. 24A) of the present invention, a user can block television programs rated TV-PG (overall program rating) that include language (specific program content) (grid 100) and violence (grid 102) and allow viewing of all other TV-PG programs, using "a two dimensional matrix" of "overall program ratings" and "specific program content." There is nothing in Abecassis that teaches or suggests "blocking or allowing viewing of television programs based on the overall program ratings and specific content ratings," as required by the independent claims 1 and 11.

Furthermore, Abecassis does not teach or suggest "blocking or allowing viewing of **television programs**," as required by the independent claims 1 and 11. The system of Abecassis is directed to a content-on-demand video system that delivers "to a viewer an automatically customized version of a single edition of the viewer-selected video responsive to the viewer's content

preferences for the level of detail and explicitness in a range of content categories." Col. 2, lines 18-24. "A content-on-demand video is a variable content video further distinguished from its linear video predecessors in that it also comprises parallel and transitional segments that enhance the seamless continuity among non-sequential segments and provide a greater range of levels of detail and explicitness." Col. 2, lines 43-49.

In fact, by emphasizing that "[c]ensuring technology, such as the 'violence chip' that would scramble reception of the incoming picture, making it possible, for example, for parents to block reception of entire programs 'deemed' violent is inferior in every respect to the content-on-demand architecture disclosed herein. The violence chip and similar technologies result from a broadcast and linear film architecture rather than a pointcast and variable content architecture. Broadcast technologies are conceptually obsolete in the pointcast era of video-on-demand technology" (Col. 4, lines 1-10), Abecassis teaches away from "blocking or allowing viewing of **television programs.**"

As a result, Abecassis does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the independent claims 1 and 11. In short, the independent claims 1 and 11 define a novel and unobvious invention over the cited references. Dependent claims 2-10 and 12-13 are all dependent from claims 1 and 11, respectively and therefore include all the limitations of claims 1 and 11, respectively and additional limitations therein. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable for the same reason set forth

Application No. 09/398,963

hereinbefore as well as the additional limitations recited.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version with markings to show changes made."

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By



Raymond R. Tabandeh
Reg. No. 43,945
626/795-9900

RRT/clv

500232